



**Meeting Minutes of the Idaho Forest Stewardship Advisory Committee (IFSAC) Meeting
Thursday, October 21, 2010**

Idaho Department of Lands Office
3284 W. Industrial Loop, Coeur d'Alene, ID.
9:30am – 3:00pm
Sundance Conference Room

Welcome & Introductions – IFSAC Chair, Oscar Baumhoff presiding

Chair Oscar Baumhoff asked committee members to introduce themselves. Each person present introduced themselves with their name and title. Oscar asked committee members to review the previous meeting's minutes and solicited questions/clarifications. A motion was made by Kirk David accept the meeting minutes from April 14, 2010, as written; this motion was seconded by Tom Davis, unanimously approved

Idaho Forest Legacy Program (FLP) Report – Ara Andrea

Discussion started with an announcement that Ed Warner, the Idaho Forest Legacy Program Coordinator, had left Idaho Department of Lands (IDL), and that IDL was in the process of hiring a new program coordinator, Karen Sjoquist. The committee was then presented with the two 2012 FLP applications proposed to be submitted for federal competition this November. Robyn Miller, representing TNC as the sponsoring land trust for the Boundary Connections project, spoke in detail about this property and the landowners. Kirk David made a motion for approval of the Idaho FLP applications; Tom Davis seconded the motion to approve both parcels, and all in favor of the motion unanimously approved. The committee approved applications going forward for the **North Idaho Timber Communities (Phase II)** and **Boundary Connections** projects.

Robyn Miller summarized what was left to finish in moving toward the closing of the McArthur Lake project; everything is moving forward and is being taken care of. Discussion continued on easement monitoring responsibilities, IDL's decision to keep the FLP Coordinator position internal, and the value to the state of the Idaho FLP.

Follow-up Item: Frank Gariglio will discuss with Idaho NRCS managers the topic of more closely connecting FLP project applications with NRCS conservation easement programs.

State & Private Forestry Redesign—Review and Discussion

Discussion between the committee, Ara Andrea and Dave Stephenson continued regarding State & Private Forestry Redesign, and the use of the State Assessment of Forest Resources (SAFR), and the Statewide Forest Response Strategy (SFRS). The purposes and mandates defined by the SFRS were reviewed, and the emphasis on collaborative approaches, and using the whole suite of State & Private Forestry Programs to achieve more effective on-the-ground strategies in high-priority landscape areas was discussed. Ara reminded the committee that these documents will replace the 5-year Forest Stewardship Program planning document, and will, eventually, replace the Forest Legacy Program Assessment of Need.

Dave reported that IDL, as well as the Western Forestry Leadership Coalition (WFLC), is looking more deeply into the processes other states have adopted to carry out their strategic (SFRS) plans, and Ara mentioned that cross-state strategies have already been discussed and acted on in relation to our competitive-grant projects. Discussion continued about the “maintenance” and updating of the SAFR and SFRS documents, the need to work on multiple-ownership issues, and the need for other groups (e.g., fire) to provide financial and substantive support for the “upkeep” of the documents and the associated processes.

Ara and Dave then talked to committee members about the need to redesign S&PF-program advisory bodies to parallel the changing needs and focal points of the programs. The committee gave insights regarding the broader “sweep” of the SFRS strategies, the functions of SFRS that drive competitive-grant funding, and concerns that strategies should focus more on “state and private” forestlands.

Discussion continued on IFSAC’s authorities and responsibilities, and where the focus of this committee should be regarding mandates, strategies and implementation of projects. The Idaho Forest Stewardship is still a “stand-alone” S&PF program, and is focused on private forestland owners, so these processes should include the participation of more landowners, and the strategies should include more landowner education. Committee members agreed that the program should be more proactive, than reactive, in deciding forward movements for the program and the IFSAC committee.

Facilitated S&PF Redesign Discussion

Facilitated by Serena Carlson, Carlson Strategic Communications

The focus of the functions of S&PF programs was reiterated: the programs are not so separate, with “stovepiped” funding, anymore. Programs now need to “dovetail” their work, and collaboratively work with outside partners and adjacent ownerships, to get a wider, landscape-level view of delivering the issue-driven, on-the-ground projects. Craig Foss gave the example of forest health being a root issue which needs to be addressed across multiple ownerships in a prioritized area. If bark beetle infestations are the major issue of concern in a certain area, then this redesigned function of the programs allows us to move in the most effective direction in developing strategies to best mitigate these types of issues. Discussion continued on the 2008 Farm Bill mandates, and its requirements that will make participation by external stakeholders very important, as well as the need for collaborative work between IFSAC, the Idaho Community Forestry Advisory Council (ICFAC) and the Idaho National Fire Plan Working Group. Also, committee members were reminded that the SFRS will require a statewide implementation working group to keep it adequately “maintained” and updated. The committee was posed with questions regarding IFSAC’s roles and functions in this “redesigned” arena, how we see other state, federal and private partners best using the SFRS, and potential opportunities for IFSAC within this new framework. Potential opportunities listed by committee members included a better focus for the planning and implementation of projects and a more targeted approach for deciding on the best areas to implement landowner outreach/education and market/promote Forest Stewardship Plan efforts. The Priority

Landscape Areas (PLAs) defined in the SFRS will help IFSAC shift gears and will provide a framework for pro-activity, for both IDL Idaho Forest Stewardship Program Staff as well as IFSAC members.

Roles of IFSAC within State & Private Forestry Redesign

IFSAC members offered the following insights with regard to how committee members can most effectively move forward as an advisory body.

- Program performance measures (specific measurable standards) need to be established and clearly understood by everybody.
- IFSAC should possibly focus their spring meeting (2011) on establishing priorities; perhaps this should be a brainstorming meeting.
- IFSAC members should form a procedure to interact with ICFAC and the National Fire Plan Working Group to address shared priorities and issues across adjacent properties.
- The national Forest Stewardship Program guidelines/standards were revised in 2009 (copies were handed out to all members), and the Idaho Forest Stewardship Program is still responsible for offering the services and managing the statewide program in the manner defined in this document. IFSAC knows that providing forest management assistance, professional planning and on-the-ground technical assistance to private landowners is still the core purpose of this program. IFSAC's role is still to encourage development and implementation of Landowner Forest Stewardship Plans (LFSPs). IFSAC is interested in how the counties are enforcing landowner "following" of their management plans, too.
- The primary focus of IFSAC should still be providing services to the NIPF landowners. The mapping done within the SAFR and SFRS show too much focus on federal lands.
- Cost-share "bundling" efforts should still be a major promotion of IFSAC.
- IFSAC can play a greater role in facilitation of landowner education projects aimed at helping landowners understand the value of ecosystem services offered by their forestlands.
- IFSAC can play a major role in the development of competitive grant applications (RFPs) and pulling in ideas and partners to generate good projects.
- IFSAC members should help in looking for different funding sources to provide more leverage in getting prioritized projects done.
- The SFRS website should have ownership layers (federal, state, NIPF, large private) and distinguish layers of forestland from layers of grassland.
- IFSAC could establish more coordination with the Community Wildfire Protection committees in prioritized areas with a big "wildfire risk" issue, and agencies like DEQ and groups with an airshed-quality focus need to be educated about the SFRS.
- IFSAC could be reformed into a core advisory committee and a broader outreach/stakeholder group.
- IFSAC might be able to assist in providing more outreach to Congress or the state legislature. IFSAC could work through a designated subcommittee and work alongside the National Association of State Foresters (NASF), the Council of Western State Foresters, the Western Forestry Leadership Coalitions, the Western Governors' Association, and the Society of American Foresters to educate policy makers on the value and purpose of the SFRS and the roles (and existence) of IFSAC. IFSAC might work more with promoting state legislator education at the Forestry Day at the Legislature, or at Tree Farm events.

Questions and Insights Specifically Targeted at Committee Makeup and Meeting Structure

- The spring meeting should include more concrete discussion about the specific roles of members of officers, and the makeup of the committee. The statewide stewardship program must still follow the guidelines set forth by the national program standards, however, there must be a wider-viewed approach of the committee.
- IFSAC members should form a procedure to interact with ICFAC and National Fire Plan Working Group to address shared priorities and issues across adjacent properties. However, the advisory groups should still continue to function separately; each program's focus areas and priorities are still different. All three advisory groups need to think about their roles, and how each intends to assist in the implementation of SFRS.
- One big advisory committee should not replace the existing three, but there should be (at least) annual interaction between the three committees. Other advisory groups may not agree with certain stewardship-focused priorities; having three separate advisory committees allows for tighter focus on certain issues. IFSAC members like the idea of "cross-pollinating" with the other two groups; a few members from each committee could be assigned to attend the other groups' meetings at least once a year. Because each advisory group still operates under separate, standard-guided funding streams, there needs to continue to be a separate group for each S&PF program.
 - Each of the three advisory committees should have two-to-three prioritized goals developed, and then representatives from each group should come together to discuss these goals and define the overlap.
- IFSAC should consider a split-day meeting, with the morning devoted to just IFSAC meeting (regarding stewardship issues), and a joint meeting if IFSAC, ICFAC and the Fire Plan Working Group in the afternoon to collectively determine cross-program priorities, and to gather input from all involved agencies/stakeholders.
- There should also be more interaction with the Idaho NRCS State Technical Advisory Committee (STAC).
- IFSAC needs to determine how they can best interact and coordinate with the many collaborative groups around the state.
- A multiple-agency group meeting would be beneficial, also (as well as multiple advisory-committee meetings), since each associated agency has oversight into many aspects of these statewide issues. Some involvement of the Idaho Forest Practices Act Advisory Committee (FPAAC) would be beneficial, too.
- The larger committee, if formed, should not be an "umbrella" committee over the three advisory committees, but a collaborative stakeholder group focused on the SAFR and the SFRS.
- IFSAC meetings should still focus on information sharing between member groups and agencies; this is very important to the existing members.
 - IFSAC should consider modifying their purpose to include "information sharing and communication."
- The IFSAC officer roles need to be discussed at the spring meeting (2011). Should the IFSAC chair meet/interact with the State Forester alongside the IDL representatives?
- IFSAC meetings should be more focused on engaging constituents, not interacting more with agency personnel.
- IFSAC membership lacks needed representation from industry, collaborative organizations, Idaho DEQ, large NIPF landowners, Congressional/legislative staff, greater numbers of NIPF landowners, municipalities, public schools, and urban forestry professionals.
- IFSAC needs to balance the amount and rate of change. Being stagnant is bad, and change is necessary, but changing for the sake of change is not good.
- Meeting effectiveness versus cost effectiveness: Should IFSAC have more frequent meetings? Should the meetings last longer (possibly multi-day)? Should videoconferencing be used more? Should program/agency reports (the "reporting-sharing session") be done the evening before?

Should meeting times be coordinated to fall adjacent to larger landowner events (e.g., the Family Forest Landowners & Managers Conference)?

- IFSAC advisory meetings need to focus beyond “programs,” thinking about forest health as a broader goal, and finding common ground with other groups and stakeholders.
- IFSAC needs to devote more thought to member roles and officer roles; will these need to be modified?
- Agendas should be developed by IFSAC in collaboration with IDL; agenda crafting should be a two-way discussion.

IFSAC Strengths and Weaknesses

IFSAC members reported their strengths: high levels of forestry knowledge and wisdom, ability to reach far into the private forestry community, ability to implement stewardship activities and communicate with landowners, commitment to stewardship goals and forest management mission, good level of information sharing, consistent member participation, diversity of members, IDL staff support, camaraderie, and high levels of coordination with other entities (e.g., RAC, NRCS, Counties, USFS). Members also reported their perceived weaknesses: lack of representation from groups needed at the table (especially NIPF landowners), lack of follow-through/engagement items on agenda, aging participants (with no succession plan), duplication in some of the planning processes, time commitment necessary to adequately do work for IFSAC, lack of working meetings, and lack of needed information regarding timberland ownership.

Meeting Wrap-Up

Serena posed several final questions to IFSAC members to ponder over the next couple of months. What do you think IFSAC should do now? There are many questions still unanswered from this meeting; how do you propose that the committee address these questions and issues? Should an IFSAC Transition Subcommittee be formed and meet before the next full IFSAC meeting to answer these questions? If it were up to you, what would you ask the committee to do next?

Members were then thanked for the active participation and interest. Serena then commended the members for their collective expertise and interest in the health and management of Idaho’s forested landscapes. She also commended them for having the courage to step into the redesign process in a way that will serve as a positive example to other advisory committees.

The next IFSAC meeting date was scheduled for January 27th, 2011, at the IDL Coeur d’Alene Office. Meeting notes were scheduled to be distributed to members by November 10th, 2010.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Ed Schneider, and seconded by Gordon Harnasch. There was unanimous approval. The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by Ara Andrea, based on the notes taken by Serena Carlson and Chanda Johnson.

LIST OF ATTENDEES

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| John DeGroot, member | Nez Perce Tribe |
| Robyn Miller, member (Vice-Chair) | The Nature Conservancy |
| Oscar Baumhoff, member (Chair) | Idaho Forest Owners Association |
| G. Kirk David, member | Idaho Tree Farm |
| Edward Schneider, member | North Idaho Forestland Owner |
| Tom Davis, member | Consulting Forester |
| Mike Wolcott, member | Consulting Forester |
| Frank Gariglio, member | USDA – Natural Resources Conservation Service |
| Clark Christiansen, member | Idaho Department of Lands, Craig Mtn. Supervisory Area |
| Mary Terra-Berns, member | Idaho Fish & Game |
| Ree Brannon, member | Clearwater RC&D |
| Chris Schnepf, member | UI Extension |
| Randy Brooks, guest | UI Extension |
| Gordon Harnasch, member | Kootenai County |
| Serena Carlson, meeting facilitator | Carlson Strategic Communications |
| Craig Foss, ex-officio | Idaho Department of Lands, Coeur d’Alene |
| Ara Andrea, member (Secretary) | Idaho Department of Lands, Coeur d’Alene |
| Joyce Jowdy, guest | Idaho Department of Lands, Coeur d’Alene |
| David Stephenson, guest | Idaho Department of Lands, Coeur d’Alene |
| Mary Fritz, guest | Idaho Department of Lands, Coeur d’Alene |
| Chanda Johnson, guest | Idaho Department of Lands, Coeur d’Alene |